UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————————

No. 04-8024

———————————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

                              Plaintiff - Appellee,

     versus

TRAVIS DWAINE CORLEY,

                              Defendant - Appellant.

———————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Aiken. Patrick Michael Duffy, District Judge.
(CR-02-963; CA-04-83-1-23)

———————————

Submitted: June 20, 2005   Decided: June 27, 2005

———————————

Before WILKINSON and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

———————————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————————

Travis Dwaine Corley, Appellant Pro Se. Jane Barrett Taylor,
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

———————————

PER CURIAM:

Travis Dwaine Corley seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) and denying reconsideration. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Corley has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Corley's motion for a certificate of appealability, deny Corley's motion to appoint counsel, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED